

polyglyceryl ester. The closest Bridgeford comes is to suggest an acetylated mono not poly glyceride. Glycerophosphoric acid is also a monoglyceride, i.e. only one glycerin molecule is bound to the inorganic phosphoric acid. No advantages are suggested by Bridgeford for using an emulsion of a polyglyceryl ester. There is in fact no suggestion that a polyglyceryl ester would have any utility in the area at all. Bridgeford therefore clearly does not teach or suggest the present invention.

Rose discloses a solution of a surfactant in mineral oil using acetylated fatty monoglyceride as a cosolvent. (Column 3, lines 64-66 and claim 1). Rose does not suggest or desire water in his system. Rose's disclosed solution is thus clearly not an aqueous emulsion and the coating is clearly not a dried aqueous emulsion. The resulting products are clearly significantly different. There is of course much higher percentage of oil in a solution in oil than in an aqueous emulsion. The percentage of oil in Rose's solution is at least 40 percent, see e.g. all of Rose's examples including the only examples of Rose containing a polyglycerol ester (7 and 12 in Table 1). By contrast, no oil at all is required by the pending claims and if oil is present at all, it is present in an amount of less than about 5 weight percent, see e.g. line 1 on page 3 of the present specification. Further, an entirely different distribution and coating properties are obtained when an aqueous emulsion is distributed, i.e. distribution of the dispersed phase occurs in the form of uniformly dispersed emulsified packets. Such packets are usually of a size of between 10 and 1000 Angstrom units ($1 \times 10^{-9} \text{M}$). The largest size of the range is equivalent to one micron. By contrast, when distribution of solution droplets occurs, as in Rose,

the droplet size cannot be expected to be below 20 microns at the smallest end of the range. The Rose reference, therefore, clearly does not disclose or suggest the present invention.

The cited Chiu et al. reference similarly does not disclose or suggest the present invention.

Chiu et al. requires two components in his system. The first is a water soluble cellulose ether (optional in accordance with the present invention) and the second is an oil or an alkylene oxide adduct of fatty acid partial esters (also optional in accordance with the present invention).

Chiu et al does not disclose or suggest a polyglyceryl ester for any purpose except insofar as it is alkoxylated to form an alkylene oxide adduct. Such adducts are typically emulsifiers having a hydrophilic alkylene oxide moiety and a fatty acid hydrophobic moiety. Such compounds are entirely different than an unmodified polyglyceryl ester. Unmodified polyglyceryl ester is not used or suggested for use by Chiu et al. in any solution or emulsion system and there is no suggestion of any advantage for doing so. It is therefore clear that Chiu et al. does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Claims 2-4, 9, 11, 13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Rose.

As previously discussed, Rose does not suggest an emulsion at all, but rather suggests a solution. As previously discussed, application of a solution yields an entirely different product than an emulsion in accordance with the invention. Rose therefore does not and cannot suggest the invention of the above claims.

Claims 2-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over either Bridgeford or Chiu et al.

As discussed above, neither Bridgeford nor Chiu et al disclose or suggest the use of a polyglyceryl ester in an emulsion for coating a food casing.

It should further be pointed out that the preferred triglyceryltetraoleate of Claims 3 and 19 is not suggested by the references for any purpose.

It is therefore clear that the above claims are patentable over these references, whether they are considered alone or in combination with each other or in combination with Rose above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all rejections should thus be withdrawn and all claims should be allowed, which action is courteously requested.

Dated: October 23, 2000

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Dunn

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 25,330

P.O.Box 10

Newfane, New York 14108

Telephone: (716) 433-1661

MLD